26 11

 # 7/13
W.Lowson
6/6/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
MAY 2 3 2003
Technology Center 2600

Applicants: JAMES E. HAILEY ET AL.
Serial No.: 09/402,294
Filed: OCTOBER 1, 1999
For: A SYSTEM FOR PROCESSING AND DECODING MPEG
COMPATIBLE DATA AND INTERNET INFORMATION
Examiner: HUNTER B. LONSBERRY
Art Unit: 2611

RESPONSE TO A NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT

Hon. Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313

Sir:

In response to the paper mailed on May 14, 2003 for which a one-month period was set to respond, please consider the following remarks.

This paper is in response to the Notice referred to above. Specifically, new Claim 20, submitted in the paper mailed on May 5, 2003, was in marked up form. This paper corrects this error, in the Claims section as identified in the Notice. No new matter was added to the Claims, from the paper submitted on May 5, 2003. For the Examiner's convenience, the content of the May 5, 2003 response is reproduced in the body of this action.

An oral interview was also conducted with the Applicants on April 1, 2003. This response to the Office Action incorporates an Applicants' Interview Response to the paper mailed on April 2, 2003.

Please charge any fees in connection with this matter to deposit account #07-0832. Applicants believe no fee is owed in connection with this response.

COMMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending.
Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, and 10 are amended.
Claim 20 is new.

Amended Claim 1 is amended to recite that the video image contributed by said first and second decoded outputs is variable "as a percentage specified by an instruction". An amendment is made to Claim 1 to distinguish how the composition of a video image is determined. Support for the amendment is found in the specification on page 17, lines 22-29, and in other places.

Claim 4 is amended to more specifically claim the composition of the program map as containing information used for identifying packet identifiers associated with MPEG compatible data and Internet data. Support for the amendment is found in the specification on page 9, lines 31-36, and in other places.

Claim 8 is amended as suggested in accordance with the comments made during the Interview with the Examiner. Specifically, this claim is directed towards the composition the video image being determined by an external instruction, not a user instruction.

Claim 9 is amended to claim a composite data stream with both MPEG and HTML data. Support for the amendment is found in the specification on page 15, lines 1-22, and in other places.

Claim 10 is amended to claim a data stream that is unidirectional that does not require a modem (as a bi-directional device) to receive web page data. Support for the amendment is found in the specification on page 14, lines 20-37, and in other places.

Claim 20 is a new claim that is supported by the same reasons used for the amendments made to Claim 8.